



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/355,673	08/19/1999	MASAYUKI YAMANA	20-4594P	6781

7590

02/07/2003

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

REDDICK, MARIE L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1713

DATE MAILED: 02/07/2003

19

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Applicant(s)	YAMANA ET AL.	
	Application No.	09/355,673	
	Examiner	Judy M. Reddick	Art Unit 1713

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-8, 12 and 14-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-8, 12, 14-22, 25-27, 29-32 and 34-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 23, 24, 28 and 33 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 01/23/03 has been entered.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 23, 24, 28 and 33 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because said claims reference two sets of claims to different features. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims 23, 24, 28 and 33 have not been further treated on the merits.

3. Claims 23, 24, 28 and 33 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. The aforementioned claims are dependent from canceled claims, viz., claims 1, 9-11 and 13, either directly or ultimately.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 2-8, 12, 14-22, 25-27, 29-32 & 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A) The recited "linear or cyclic silicones, esters, diesters, ketones and ethers" per claims 2, 37 and 38 constitutes indefinite subject matter as per it not being readily ascertainable as to

Art Unit: 1713

whether the "linear or cyclic" governs the "silicones" only or also the "esters", "diesters", "ketones" and "ethers".

B) *The recited "glycol ethers, esters and diesters" per claim 12 constitutes indefinite subject matter as per it not being readily ascertainable as to whether the "glycol" is intended to qualify the "ethers" only or the "esters" and "diesters" as well.*

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. *The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:*

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. *The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:*

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. *Claims 2-8, 12, 14-22, 25-27, 29-32 and 34-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Misaizu et al as per reasons of record per paper no. 16, 09/23/02. Further, the copolymer per Misaizu et al, in latex form, contains recurring monomer units that overlap in scope with recurring monomer units (I)-(III) and (IV) and/or (V). See cols. 2-6, Runs and the claims of Misaizu et al.*

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. *The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:*

Art Unit: 1713

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Misaizu et al (U.S. 5,068,295).

Mizaizu et al as applied to claims 2-8, 12, 14-22, 25-27, 29-32 and 34-37. Further, while Misaizu et al only disclose, as a solvent, ether compounds which are generic to the claimed glycol ethers, such necessarily implies that any ether compound, including the claimed glycol ether compound, would have been operable within the scope of patentees invention and with a reasonable expectation of success. Criticality for such, commensurate in scope with the claims, not having been demonstrated on this record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

11. Claims 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over JP'695(Yoshio et al) as per reasons of record stated in paper no.16, 09/23/02. Further the copolymers of JP'695 contain repeating monomer units overlapping in scope with the claimed copolymer containing repeating units (I) – (III) and (IV) and/or (IV). See pages 3-5 of JP'695.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments filed 01/23/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Relative to JP'295 and Misaizu et al---The crux of Counsel's arguments appear to hinge on the claimed copolymers not being taught in the Runs of Misaizu et al or JP'295. To this end, the specification need not contain an example if the invention is otherwise disclosed in such a manner that one skilled in the art will be able to practice it without an undue

Art Unit: 1713

amount of experimentation(In re Borkowski, 422 F 2d. 904, 908, 164 USPQ 642, 645 (CCPA 1970)).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Judy M. Reddick whose telephone number is (703)308-4346. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 6:30 a.m.-3:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu can be reached on (703)308-2450. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)872-9310 for regular communications and (703)892-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-8183.

J. M. Reddick
Judy M. Reddick
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1713

JMR *JMR*
February 6, 2003